

REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1 - 18, 28 - 32, and newly added claims 38 - 51. Claims 19 - 27 and 33 - 37 were previously cancelled.

Claims 1 - 18 and 28 - 32 were rejected as anticipated by Hitchcock et al. The rejection has been carefully considered, and it is believed that the claims, as amended herein, patently distinguish from Hitchcock et al.

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite the step of reading a configuration file to determine whether the object is available to the Web server. Thus, whether the web page element with which the object is associated is displayed ultimately depends on whether there is information in the configuration file.

Hitchcock et al. do not teach or even remotely suggest this approach. In fact, a thorough review of Hitchcock et al. discloses no teaching or suggestion of consulting a configuration file. There may be some data files that are examined in Hitchcock et al., but these are not configuration files. The configuration file is especially useful in that it contains information concerning what components or objects are available for use, so that form elements associated with objects that are not available for use are not displayed, thus avoiding the confusion, frustration and waste of time associated with displaying form elements that a user may click on, but that produce no results.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claim 1 is directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added claims 38 to 42 serve to further distinguish the invention from Hitchcock et al. and are discussed below.

New claim 38 (support in specification on page 10, lines 1 - 7), states that the object is a program associated with a suite of programs which may be installed or uninstalled, and that the configuration file indicates whether the program is installed. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Hitchcock et al. of this approach.

New claim 39 (support in specification on page 11, line 25 to page 12, line 3), recites updating the configuration file periodically to determine availability of at least one of the object and other objects. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of such periodic updating in Hitchcock et al.

In response to the prior interchange with the Examiner concerning the order of the steps of claim 1, new claim 40, has been added to positively recite that step (a) is performed prior to step (d). Thus, for reasons of record in the previous amendment, it is submitted that claim 40 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

New claim 41 (support in specification on page 13, lines 12 - 15), recites the step of creating a hash file of

data stored in the configuration file for use in determining whether to display the markup language form element. Thus, the data is stored in a compact form for efficient use by, for example, a display server program, to create the page to be displayed. Hitchcock et al. has absolutely no teaching or suggestion of this approach.

New claim 42 (support in specification on page 13, lines 18 -22) recites an advantageous default, wherein if the configuration file does not contain a reference to an object (by mistake the configuration file was not updated), the element associated with the object will be displayed. Hitchcock et al. is completely silent with respect to the approach of claim 42.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 38 to 42 are all directed to patentable subject matter.

Independent claims 11 and 28 have been amended in a manner analogous to claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 28 are patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Further new claims 43 - 46 and 48 - 51 are analogous to new claims 38, 39, 41, and 42 discussed above. For the reasons stated for claims 38, 39, 41, and 42, it is submitted that claims 43 - 46 and 48 - 51 are also directed to patentable subject matter.

If there is any issue that remains that can be resolved by telephone, the undersigned and the applicant would greatly appreciate a telephone call to the

undersigned at the telephone number set forth below, with a view to resolving such issue, and passing this application to issue.

A check for \$1,020 for a three-month extension of time to file this paper is enclosed.

It is believed that no claim fees are due. However, if any other fee is required, please charge deposit account number 50-0510 for such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker
David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277
23 Southern Road
Hartsdale, NY 10530
Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094

1/19/2006
Date